

and fury that I feel when I hear people suggest that defense or space contracts be awarded on a basis of need rather than ability.

Let me first extend my thanks to you as a professional person, not as a constituent, for your firm stand against this type of thinking. I realize that in your political position it is necessary for you to respond to such attacks for purely political reasons and I use the word in the most humanistic sense. However, having heard you speak, I believe you also feel the injustice of such an approach. We are all grateful to you for speaking up. We hope you will continue to do so.

In April of this year, in our company publication, I discussed the subject of geographical distribution of Government contracts. I am sending you a copy of this publication which contains a restrained expression of my feelings. Senator HUMPHREY's reference to the fact that there is more smog out here pains me greatly because of its truth; also, because of the fact that I honestly believe that the solution of that problem is political and economic—not technical.

The reason for the unequal distribution of Government contracts geographically, however, is due to the "mental smog" in the East. The youthful vigor and imaginative approach to the technological problems that keep our country strong is developing in the West—not in the East. There is nothing that any legislation can do about it. Contractors who obtain work in the East find, in large measure, that they have to subcontract a great deal of their work to the West anyway. The work must flow where the capability exists. Anyone who wants to tamper with the future security of this country can do so if he wants to—but I want no part of it and wherever I see such a thing happening I want to raise my voice loudly.

Keep fighting—your cause is just.

Very truly yours,

A. M. ZAREM,
President.

THE EMBARGO AGAINST IMPORTATION OF CUBAN TOBACCO AND THE CIGAR INDUSTRY OF TAMPA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the embargo imposed last year against further importation of Cuban tobacco had a very serious impact on that sizable portion of the cigar industry of Tampa, Fla., by which for 75 years the "All-Havana" cigar was perfected and marketed throughout the United States. Sudden loss of its source of supply caused widespread economic hardship on both management and cigar factory workers, not to mention serious dislocations in industries associated with the production, packaging, labeling and marketing of all-Havana cigars.

Being the good Americans which they are, the Tampa all-Havana tobacco management people and workers accepted the embargo as a necessary step in our Nation's fight against communism in Cuba, even though the burden of it rested heavily upon them and their families.

It is greatly to their credit that these people refused defeat by a bad situation not of their making and completely beyond their control. On the contrary, they immediately cast about for new ways to keep their plants open by developing new products to substitute for the exclusive ones which they produced for so many years. This has been an excellent

example of labor-management cooperation and all concerned are due the highest commendations for the way they have gone about overcoming a serious handicap.

Today each Senator will have delivered to his office a complimentary package of the new cigar which one of the leading manufacturers in Tampa has developed as a substitute for the "All-Havana" cigar by using a combination of domestic and other tobaccos. These are presented through Senator SMATHERS and myself with the hope that devotees of the pastime will find the new cigars enjoyable. Those who do not smoke may, if they wish, pass the cigars along to a friend who does.

I again point to this product as an example of American genius and initiative which was born in adversity but from what I can hear has a bright future before it in spite of the heavy existing competition with which it is confronted.

NEW THREAT—RED BASES IN MOROCCO

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in this historical moment Americans are struggling with the threat of a Soviet base of operations 90 miles from their shore. Not even having finished his Cuban incursion, Khrushchev is already spreading feelers into another strategic location; namely, North Africa. The country in question is Morocco. Soviet bases, strategically placed there, could easily control the entrance to the Mediterranean Sea. They could also threaten our bases in Spain and our fleet now located in the Mediterranean. News about these Soviet attempts are disturbing; we need a firm policy to counter this Soviet probe.

Mr. President, in the 1950's the United States spent \$400 million to construct a complex of air bases in Morocco. But since then, the Moroccan Government has pressured the United States into evacuating one of those bases already and into planning to evacuate all of them by the end of 1963. Latest reports indicate that the Soviet aim seems to be to use evacuated American bases for their own airplanes. Such an occurrence would be a catastrophic failure of our policy in Morocco.

Mr. President, I now ask for unanimous consent that this highly disturbing report be printed in the RECORD. The story appears in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW THREAT—RED BASES IN MOROCCO

RABAT, MOROCCO.—Here in Morocco, as in Cuba, Khrushchev's Russia is breaking out of the bonds of "containment" to threaten an area vital to the Western World.

The United States in the 1950's constructed a complex of big air bases here at a cost of \$400 million.

Under pressure from the Moroccan Government, which gained its independence in 1956, the United States has evacuated one of those bases and by the end of 1963 will have evacuated all of them.

As the United States moves out, Russia is making highly effective efforts to move in.

ON THE WHARVES

Soviet arms now are being delivered to Morocco by the shipload, under an agreement recently signed by Moscow.

Russian jet planes, sold to Morocco, already are parked on the U.S.-built base that is now operated by Moroccans.

Soviet bases inside Morocco may be next. At this time, negotiations are underway on a Russian proposal to build—

A submarine base on the Moroccan coast at Alhucemas, just 20 miles from Gibraltar.

A shipyard, capable of building ships of up to 10,000 tons, in Tangier.

This Soviet offer, if accepted by the Moroccan Government, would give the Russians a firm foothold at the most vulnerable part of the Mediterranean.

There, installations built and operated by Russians would be within a few miles of the British base guarding the entrance of the Mediterranean at Gibraltar, and of the U.S. naval base at Rota, on the coast of Spain.

Any Soviet bases in this area also would be within easy range of the American complex of air bases in Spain. With submarines, the Russians could threaten as well the major U.S. fleet now based in the Mediterranean.

Whether Morocco's 33-year-old King Hassan II will go along with this latest Soviet proposal is still unclear. Western diplomats here are hoping that the Moroccans' pride in independence will keep them from agreeing to a new set of foreign bases. Soviet success in recent months in breaking the bonds of containment in this area, however, has been efficient and effective. So U.S. observers here are taking nothing for granted.

TONS OF "HARDWARE"

As of now, evidence of Soviet activity is apparent in growing stockpiles of Russian-made arms in Morocco.

Soviet freighters, laden with weapons and vehicles, have been putting in at Casablanca for the past 5 months.

As in Cuba, unloading operations have been conducted under tight security guard, with the dock sealed off, and the movement of arms from the port made almost entirely at night.

Shipments have included Soviet tanks, tons of small arms, artillery, military trucks, antitank guns, helicopters, ammunition, even small naval vessels.

Several dozen late-model Soviet jet planes have been shipped in, too, including at least 16 MIG-17s.

Some Soviet submarines are reported to have been transferred to the Moroccans. This report is not confirmed, but such a transfer could be used to justify the Russian offer to build a sub base for Morocco.

At least four sizable Russian freighters have been involved in these recent arms shipments. Each is estimated to carry about 7,000 tons of munitions per trip.

TRANSPORTS FROM UNITED STATES

While Russia has been shipping in these major quantities of arms and equipment for Morocco's 35,000-man armed force, the United States has limited its aid largely to transport planes.

To compete with this Soviet arms aid, the United States is offering now to double or triple its military and economic aid to Morocco, at a time when the Moroccans are acquiring the air bases and housing facilities on which America has spent hundreds of millions.

Reason for this growing U.S. concern is not hard to find.

Since the death of King Mohammed in 1961, Moroccan dealings with Russia have become open, frequent, and increasingly productive. Soviet technical missions have been here almost continuously. Russia's Defense Minister Malinovsky and a Soviet military mission headed by Marshal Soko-

lovsky have visited Rabat. Morocco's defense chiefs have been in Moscow, and there signed military agreements.

Morocco, in other words, is getting intensive Soviet effort and attention at this time. This effort is beginning to pay off, despite occasional setbacks for the Russians. The big prize, still sought, will be air and sea bases available to the Soviets in this end of the Mediterranean.

With effective bases here, planes and ships from Morocco could dominate the West's supply lines to the Mediterranean. A submarine base at the narrow entrance to this inland sea could be particularly handy.

U.S.-BUILT BASES FOR REDS?

A related Soviet aim appears now to be an understanding with King Hassan II that would permit Russian planes to use the big, American-built air bases here, thus threatening U.S. bases in Spain.

Soviet successes, kept largely under cover thus far, now are coming out in the open with an attempt to get actual bases in Morocco. In this vital area, the threat is becoming increasingly clear.

ARTHUR KROCK AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, on September 20, in the course of the debate on the so-called Cuba resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 230—I inserted in the RECORD a column from the New York Times of September 18 by Mr. Arthur Krock. I also set forth my reasons for thinking Mr. Krock was mistaken to single me out as an administration spokesman who was interpreting our current policy toward Cuba more candidly than the administration itself was prepared to do. My position is that mid-20th century circumstances have modified one portion of the Monroe Doctrine—namely, our stated determination to remain aloof from European affairs. Time and changing world conditions have drastically altered this resolve, but they have not altered our determination to resist Communist encroachments anywhere in the world and especially in the Western Hemisphere. Factors outside the control of the Kennedy administration have accounted for any formal modification of the Monroe Doctrine which may have taken place. The President's statement of September 13, therefore, which I referred to as the "Kennedy Doctrine," served as a necessary supplement to our understanding of the current applicability of the Monroe Doctrine.

Nevertheless, I should regret it very much if my remarks were interpreted as a fundamental disagreement with Mr. Krock's main argument. As I understand it, Mr. Krock was saying, in his column of September 18 and in his subsequent article of September 20, that a de facto modification of the Monroe Doctrine had taken place and that this was wholly justifiable under present-day circumstances. If anyone felt that I was attacking Mr. Krock's judgment and perception, then let me set the record straight without further ado. I meant it when I said that I have the highest respect for Arthur Krock. He is the dean of our commentators on the bedrock issues of the United States in world affairs. If he misinterpreted my role as a spokesman on U.S. policy toward Cuba,

I am nevertheless flattered that he saw my position in a favorable light. I am neither so dogmatic nor so ungrateful as to reject a compliment from an individual whose professional qualifications and achievements I so much respect and admire.

I have just received a letter from Arthur Krock enclosing what he describes as "a most realistic and informed presentation of the thesis of your recent speech to the Senate and your letter to the New York Times" which was published on September 24. The author of the enclosure is a retired military officer who for obvious reasons does not wish to be identified. Mr. Krock observes that I might wish to revert to this subject in any subsequent remarks on the floor of the Senate.

Indeed, I am highly pleased to share this memorandum with Senators at the earliest opportunity after receiving Mr. Krock's letter. The memorandum is permeated with the clear logic of a man who has received a military education and who has remained a sensitive student of world history. I commend his observations unreservedly to the Members of this body. There can be no disagreement between Arthur Krock and myself concerning its merits. Nor do I hesitate to reaffirm my respect for the eloquence and the basic truth of Mr. Krock's own articles on the subject:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE MONROE DOCTRINE— YESTERDAY AND TODAY (AUTHOR ANONYMOUS)

Of course the Monroe Doctrine is ruptured. It was 100 years ago, by Napoleon. Then, as now, we were constrained from acting. Then by internal danger, today by external. But in the end Sheridan's army on the Rio Grande, backing Juarez's guerrillas (they were hardly more) restored the balance.

But can the Monroe Doctrine in its literal terms, be successfully invoked in these days? I amused myself the other day by noting, in parallel columns, the controlling factors as they were in 1823 and in 1962. Their divergence is startling. Our military strength, for instance—insignificant in 1823; appallingly strong in 1962. The oceans—strong shields for us in 1823; weak and even menacing in 1962. The Latin American—a weak chick in 1823, just out of his colonial shell: a fighting cock in 1962, proud, very jealous of his independence and his own right to maintain it. And so on for other controlling factors—the British Navy; our commitments in the Old World; our agreements in the new; and, perhaps the most astonishing of all, war itself.

The Kennedy doctrine, I take it, lays down military offensive as the threat to our peace and safety. This of course is quite another thing from the extension of European systems condemned by the Monroe Doctrine. It really means that hereafter we play it by ear. For there will no longer be a definite line a foreign power must not cross. All military forces are now offensive, or potentially so. The purely defensive forms—the Maginot Lines and the heavy seacoast forts—are things of the past. This is a period in which the offensive is overwhelmingly stronger than the defensive. They have alternated in supremacy, as you know, throughout military history. Only some 45 years ago the defensive superiority kept great armies in their trenches, and fleets secure in their harbors throughout a long world war. But who can now foresee the overthrow of the offensive in this atomic and space age? The Kennedy doctrine must be invoked, not on fact but on a nice judgment of balanced factors.

I suggest a reprint of Secretary Olney's dispatch to the British in the Venezuela incident of our youth. It shows so clearly our autocratic stand on the Monroe Doctrine, not so very long ago in time but immeasurably distant in international relations.

THE CHIEF OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, too often we accept the dedicated services of our most able public servants as a matter of course. And yet, within our Federal service are many individual men and women who give generously of their experience, understanding, and time in order to do a job far beyond the average. Many of the persons in our Immigration and Naturalization Service fit that description; they perform their daily work with sympathy and expert knowledge; they help other persons who would otherwise be overwhelmed by the technicalities and formalities that so often occur with entry to a new nation.

A tribute was paid in the August 30 edition of the Record, Hackensack, N.J., to one of these workers. He is Mr. Dominick F. Rinaldi, director of the Newark office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. He is therefore responsible for all aliens entering or residing in the State. The article describes his philosophy toward his work and some of the methods he uses to accomplish it. I think that his performance is typical of others in the Service. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF OF IMMIGRATION NEEDS VARIED TALENT

As director of the Newark office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Dominick F. Rinaldi, of Closter, must assume daily the various roles of economist, diplomat, judge, and humanitarian.

He must consider economy when the influx of a group of immigrants might endanger our domestic economy. He must wield tact and diplomacy in accepting or rejecting the entrance of immigrants. And since he often has the final word on entrance permits, extensions of residence, and deportation decisions, he must employ the delicacy of both a judge and humanitarian.

After 21 years of work with the Service, Rinaldi can boast of a wealth of experience in each of these fields. He began his career with a position in the Service's Detroit office. From there he went to Rome where he was officer-in-charge of an area covering northern Italy, Spain, Portugal, Malta, the Azores, and Africa.

His most recent assignment before coming to Newark was an assistant deputy director of the New York district.

TASK IS COMPLEX

The Newark office is responsible for all aliens entering or residing in the State. This involves initial checking of their papers upon entry to the country, granting permission to extend residence, reviewing applications for citizenship, and investigating the activity of aliens residing here.

An alien wishing to enter the country for a longer period than a travel visa would allow must first register his intention with the U.S. Consulate nearest his native town where he is placed on a quota list. Receiving priority on this list are those with special skills or education. Many American companies recruit chemists, engineers, and skilled craftsmen from abroad and if these workers meet

kind of cooperation that there ought to be between Government and business in the field, in country after country.

Our commercial attachés in the embassies should be working with our business concerns in obtaining new markets. Every one of the facilities of this Government relating to foreign trade should be coordinated at the embassy level.

This means that our ambassadors, while they may be very well experienced in the field of normal diplomacy, must also have some sense of awareness about economic development and the improvement and expansion of our economy. I am not one of those who believe that diplomacy can consist merely of the niceties related to what we call the traditional diplomatic operations. An ambassador in charge of an embassy of the United States today must understand economic development. He must understand foreign trade. He must, in a sense, be a manager. He must in a sense be a director of a great multiple operation. We expect our ambassadors to be not merely striped pants diplomats—all that is required, of course; and I do not deprecate the necessity of an ambassador being a good diplomat in the formal sense of that term—but he must also be a go-getter; he must be a coordinator; he must be a worker with every one of the economic areas of our Government and of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Washington Post, of September 25, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The article discusses the speech made by Robert V. Roosa, Treasury Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, in which he warned, at Atlantic City, in addressing the convention of the American Bankers' Association, that restoration of world confidence in the U.S. dollar must not give rise to "vain hopes that mere monetary reform can substitute for basic measures" in wiping out the red ink on this country's international transactions.

Then Mr. Roosa went on to tell some simple truths. He said that this country must get to work to expand its trade and develop new markets. I congratulate him and the Treasury Department for this forthright expression.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE EXPORTS URGED FOR DOLLAR SAFETY

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., September 25.—Robert V. Roosa, Treasury Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, warned today that restoration of world confidence in the U.S. dollar must not give rise to "vain hopes that mere monetary reform can substitute for basic measures" in wiping out the red ink on this country's international transactions.

"To sink back into complacency would be to undermine all our very real achievements to date," Roosa told the annual convention of the American Bankers Association here.

Roosa, who at a meeting of international bankers last week was given much of the credit for ending the dollar crisis, said that progress in defending the dollar has been gratifying. But, he said, it does not mean that "any of us can slacken in any way the drive toward getting this country's international accounts into balance."

The Treasury official put in a strong plea for the administration's proposal to grant a 7-percent tax credit for business investment

and for an overall reduction in the tax structure to enable this country to compete more effectively in world markets.

"We simply cannot afford to carry on indefinitely, in this competitive world, with a tax structure that dulls initiative and brings the economy at levels well below its full potential," he said.

Roosa said the real challenge to overcoming this Nation's balance-of-payments deficit is a further rise in business exports. He said it is realistic to aim for an export rise "not in hundreds of millions but in billions" within the next 2 years.

Roosa said that the recent cooperation of foreign central banks in shoring up the defenses of the dollar was done on the conviction that this country will not drag its feet in putting its own financial house in order.

EXHIBIT I.—Financing authorized by Eximbank

[In millions of dollars]

Category	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Project loans.....	609	347	511	416	555
Emergency foreign trade loans.....	258	163	130	353	500
Exporter credits and guarantees.....	24	3	99	132	459
Agricultural commodity loans.....	73	36	44	64	3
Subtotal.....	964	549	784	965	1,517
Short-term political risk guarantees.....				130	
Comprehensive short-term insurance, FICA (since February).....					331
Subtotal.....				130	331
Total.....	964	549	784	1,095	1,848

¹ 6 months.

² Includes standby stabilization credit to Canada of \$400 million.

³ Includes small percentage of short-term political risk guarantees authorized prior to beginning of FICA operations in February.

INDIANA DUNES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 23, the Washington Post carried an editorial entitled "Shoreline Tragedy" in which it urged that the administration and Congress save the Indiana dunes and not allow a port, harbor, and steel mills to be built in the middle of these most beautiful and unique dunes. As Carl Sandburg has said:

The dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite is to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity: Once lost the loss would be irrevocable.

This morning's New York Times continues its public-spirited efforts in behalf of an adequate national park in the dunes with an excellent editorial statement of the need for the Army Engineers and the Budget Bureau to desist from efforts to destroy the dunes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these superb editorials appear in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1962]

SHORELINE TRAGEDY

Reportedly, Bureau of the Budget approval is imminent for the Burns Ditch Harbor on Lake Michigan. This is melancholy news, because it could spell the end of any hope for a national seashore area incorporating the

matchless Indiana dunes. As Secretary of Interior Udall wrote to the Bureau, if the port is constructed, "the possibility of establishing a unit of the National Park System in this area of Lake Michigan will be foreclosed for all time."

The Indiana dunes are a natural treasure of a unique kind. They stretch for a few miles along the lake and contain, as in a living laboratory, the whole geological and biological history of the struggle between billowing dunes, forest and water. What makes the dunes especially precious is the location within easy access of the Chicago metropolitan area, thereby providing a recreational area for a densely populated region.

But an essential strip of the dunes belongs to the National and Bethlehem Steel companies. Plans are underway for intensive industrial development that would wipe out the dunes and spoil a small State park already located in the area. Legislative efforts to save the dunes have failed in good part because Indiana political leaders find it hard to resist the slogan "payrolls, not picnics." But the verdict in Indiana is far from unanimous. Representative RAY J. MADDEN of adjoining (and industrial) Lake County is for saving the dunes, as is the Steelworkers Union.

In his conservation message of February 28, President Kennedy called for the creation of a National Lakeshore Park in northern Indiana. Some 250,000 persons have petitioned to Congress to save the dunes. But thus far all this has been to no avail and the Federal Government seems about to spend \$25.6 million to build a harbor in the middle of the dunes. The doubts remain. Is it really too late to consider alternate sites in Michigan City or Lake County? Is it impossible to build a ship canal that would place the harbor inland and spare the dunes?

Before the Bureau makes its final judgment, surely one final reappraisal is in order to determine whether Indiana could have its steel plants and still let the public have the dunes.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 26, 1962]

INDIANA DUNES CAN BE SAVED

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and others working to save the Indiana dunes from industrial obliteration have pointed out that there are better ways and better places to provide a deepwater port for northern Indiana than by dredging out a site in the heart of the dunes. The U.S. Corp of Engineers has declined to study the alternatives and is now asking the Budget Bureau, an arm of the White House, to give its approval to this destructive project.

Last February, in his widely applauded conservation message to Congress, President Kennedy called for creation of an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. If the President meant what he said, he will direct the corps to ignore the pressures being exerted by some Indiana politicians and by the steel companies that own land in the dunes and to come up with a plan that will save this irreplaceable shoreline recreational area. It is still possible to save it if there is a desire to do so.

NATO AND THE SOVIET BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a UPI dispatch by Stewart Hensley in this morning's press indicates that some of our allies still have to be shown that they cannot differentiate between a Communist threat on their borders and a Communist threat elsewhere in the world.

According to the reported views of Norwegian Foreign Minister Halvard

Lange, Cuba is essentially an "American problem." He concedes that it might eventually "develop into a problem for the free world," but until it does he sees no possibility of interfering with the long-range charters under which Norwegian vessels carry supplies between the Soviet bloc and Cuba.

Mr. President, Norway is one of the staunchest of our partners in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Norway entered this alliance because her experience with Nazi Germany taught her that dictators do not respect a unilateral declaration of neutrality. Her commitment to the Western Alliance has not sat well with some elements of her population, yet for years she has maintained the faith and has shouldered the common burden—often in the face of crude and violent threats and pressure from the Soviet Union. Moreover, shipping is the very lifeblood of Norwegian economic health, and it will be particularly important if, for one reason or another, Norway should be excluded from the European Common Market. It is my hope and plea that the inner six—the EEC—shall include all of the outer seven—EFTA.

Having said this, Mr. President, I want to register my firm disagreement with the reasoning attributed to the Norwegian Foreign Minister, a man for whom I entertain the highest respect. Cuba, Mr. President, is already a problem for the whole free world. To the extent that our allies either directly or indirectly contribute to the longevity of the Castro regime, to the extent that they help the Soviets bolster the sagging Cuban economy and defenses, they are undermining the position of the United States and are contributing to the entrenchment of communism. This surely is not a matter of indifference to them. The Secretary of State unquestionably has plenty of arguments, backed by solid and sufficient evidence, for the NATO governments to bring pressure to bear so as to halt these injurious practices. The Secretary of State also has the full and explicit backing of Congress in his discussions with our allies.

I urge him to continue those discussions. I am confident that he will pursue this matter with the utmost energy and persistence. I am likewise confident that he will achieve mutually satisfactory results. This is little enough to ask of our friends in view of the worldwide commitments which we have undertaken in their behalf; it is little enough in view of our determination to solve the Cuban menace almost 100 percent through our own efforts. All that we require is recognition of the fact that Cuba is 90 miles from the NATO defense perimeter, not merely 90 miles from the continental United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Challenge to the Free," published in the Washington Star of September 25, 1962; and an article entitled "Rusk Reported Unable to Get Norway to Halt Ships to Cuba," written by Stewart Hensley, and published in the Washington Post of September 26, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial

and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 25, 1962]

CHALLENGE TO THE FREE

Although he has met with little success so far, Secretary of State Rusk is continuing his efforts to persuade the free maritime countries—particularly our NATO allies—to cooperate with the United States in clamping down on strategic shipments to Communist Cuba.

To that end, during his current visit to New York for the 17th session of the United Nations General Assembly, Mr. Rusk will have a series of conversations with numerous Western foreign ministers. The first of these talks has been with Britain's Lord Home, and although the latter is said to have been less than positive in his response, the Secretary apparently feels that the gentle art of persuasion may yet pay off in the form of effective allied action against the Havana tyranny.

At any rate, as Mr. Rusk has made clear, what the United States seeks is a program under which the following would happen: (1) Countries like Canada, Britain, West Germany, and Greece would stop exporting to Cuba such things as machinery, chemicals, and industrial raw materials. And (2) the governments of the Atlantic community would dissuade their shipping interests from chartering vessels to carry Soviet cargoes and technicians to Havana. Essentially the same measures have been advocated by the American Merchant Marine Institute, which represents management, and by our top maritime labor leaders, who have urged unionized seamen throughout the free world to refuse to sail any ships headed with strategic goods for the Kremlin's menacing new base in the Western Hemisphere.

However, although West Germany has indicated a favorable attitude, the general NATO reaction to Mr. Rusk's proposals has been largely negative up to now. Britain and a number of our other allies have suggested, for example, that the United States takes too grim a view of Cuba. Further, they have intimated that their domestic laws, and the fact that they maintain diplomatic relations with Fidel Castro's Kremlin-serving dictatorship, make it difficult for them to engage in an embargo on Cuban trade. So Mr. Rusk, wholly apart from his cheerless meetings with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, has his work cut out for him in New York.

First of all, he must try to shatter the complacency of some of our allies by making clear that the threat in Cuba, in its potential at least, is indeed most grave, not merely for us, but for the entire free world. And second, while putting emphasis on this reality, he must convince the British and others that unless they join us in cutting down on strategic shipments to Havana, they will be bolstering Castro's wobbly economy. As a result, in turn, they will be strengthening the Kremlin's grip on the island, paving the way for further Red subversion in Latin America, and thus striking another serious blow against the West's global position.

In these circumstances, it is hard to understand why our allies take what seems to be an altogether cavalier view. What is happening in Cuba is not, an inconsequential comic opera; on the contrary, it involves a supremely provocative display of naked Soviet power in one of the West's most sensitive areas. The challenge in that respect is not to Americans alone, but to freemen everywhere.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 26, 1962]
RUSK REPORTED UNABLE TO GET NORWAY TO HALT SHIPS TO CUBA

(By Stewart Hensley)

New York, September 24.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk tried today to persuade

NATO ally Norway to help the United States isolate Communist Cuba but apparently made no headway.

Norwegian Foreign Minister Halvard Lange told newsmen, after a 55-minute conference with Rusk on this and other matters, that his government viewed Cuba as essentially an "American problem." He acknowledged, however, that it might "develop into a problem for the free world."

Lange said that Norwegian ships engaged in the trade between the Soviet bloc and Cuba were on long-term charters to the Communists and his government had "no control" over them.

Lange and Rusk, according to U.S. officials, covered a wide variety of international matters, including Berlin and European security. They actually put in more time on Berlin than anything else, presumably in preparation for Rusk's critical Tuesday luncheon conference with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on East-West differences.

Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Robert Manning said the Rusk-Gromyko meeting would not be confined exclusively to Berlin or any other single issue. He disclosed, however, that Rusk has called his special assistant on Berlin, Martin Hillenbrand, here from Washington to sit in on the meeting at the Waldorf Towers.

Berlin was also on the agenda for discussion by Rusk and Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak at a midafternoon conference. But the principal issue was the Congo, where both countries are supporting United Nations efforts to integrate break-away Katanga Province into the central government headed by Cyrille Adoula. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson participated in the meeting with Spaak, as did Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs George C. McGhee.

Other highlights of Rusk's day included a luncheon conference as the guest of Japanese Foreign Minister Masayoshi Ohishi and a meeting with Luxembourg Foreign Minister Eugene Schaus.

Rusk and Ohishi discussed United States and Japanese relations with the European Common Market, Japan's efforts to restore normal relations with South Korea and Tokyo's continuing pressure for return of the American-held Ryukyu Islands.

Tonight Rusk gave a dinner in his hotel suite for about a dozen persons in honor of Afghanistan Foreign Minister Prince Mohamed Naim.

Rusk said he did not think he would comment at this time on Lange's assertion, similar to one made yesterday by British officials, that Cuba was primarily an American problem. He told newsmen, in response to questions, that he had nothing to say on this issue right now.

Lange said that Norwegian ships engaged in trade between Soviet bloc nations and Cuba were not carrying arms, ammunition or other highly strategic goods "so far as we know."

Although Rusk would not discuss the matter publicly, American officials privately made no secret of the fact that they disagree heartily with the British and Norwegian contention that Cuba is essentially a U.S. problem.

(The British doubt a U.S. premise that Castro's government can be made to collapse by economic strangulation, Lewis B. Fleming of the Los Angeles Times reported from the United Nations.)

(The British believe that such a policy could not work short of acts of war like forcefully interfering with shipments to Cuba. And the British would oppose such action.)

(American proposals for a cessation of trade with Cuba are regarded as useless by the British, who point out that Cuba's needs can easily be met by shipments from other nations even if all the NATO allies were to enter into an agreement.)

Rusk, here for a 10-day series of consultations with Allied, neutralist, and Communist foreign ministers, has several sessions scheduled for Tuesday in addition to that with Gromyko.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the Calendar beginning with Calendar No. 2088, Senate Joint Resolution 208, and continuing through Calendar No. 2092, House Concurrent Resolution 474.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of thirteen members as follows:

(1) Four members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(2) Four members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(3) One representative of the Department of the Interior who shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior and who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and

(4) Four members to be appointed by the President of the United States.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration, in 1963, of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

Sec. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with agencies of State and local governments, with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those

powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within one year following the termination of the celebration as prescribed by this joint resolution. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of \$25,000.

WEST VIRGINIA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 213) to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I urge favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 213. The resolution authorizes an expenditure of not to exceed \$100,000 for the Federal Government's participation in West Virginia's 1963 centennial celebration. The appropriation which would be authorized would permit the U.S. Department of Commerce to immediately design and construct commemorative exhibits which would deal with the 100th anniversary of West Virginia's statehood. The exhibits would be displayed in a car on a train which would travel throughout the State starting on May 1, 1963. The resolution would also waive procurement statutes so as to require formal advertising by the Government for design and construction of the exhibits. This waiver is necessary both from the standpoint of the element of time, and from the fact that the design and construction of the exhibits involve expert work, the specifications for which do not lend themselves readily to routine advertising procedures.

I cite the following record of congressional actions as possible precedents for approval, in this instance, of Senate Joint Resolution 213:

Connecticut, 300th anniversary of founding of colony: A joint resolution established a commission, to be composed of 16 members, for U.S. participation in observance of the anniversary, and authorized an appropriation of \$10,000 for actual and necessary expenses. (May 14, 1935, 49 Stat. 244.)

Louisiana Territory, 100th anniversary of purchase: An act authorized a commission of nine members, to be appointed by the President, to cooperate with the local Louisiana Purchase Exposition Co. for the preparation of plans for the celebration. (A total of \$1,486,609, plus \$9,500,000, reimbursable,

was appropriated under several acts, viz., 31 Stat. 644, 1443-44; 32 Stat. 445-446, 1108; 33 Stat. 18, 402, 35 Stat. 1026; 38 Stat. 230; and 39 Stat. 30.) (March 3, 1901; 31 Stat. 1440-45.)

Massachusetts Bay Colony, 300th anniversary of founding: A joint resolution established a commission of 15 members for U.S. participation in observance of anniversary of founding; and authorized an appropriation of \$10,000 for expenses. (June 27, 1930, 46 Stat. 827.)

Tennessee centennial: The act created a board of management to be composed of representatives from the Executive Department, the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum, and the U.S. Fish Commission, to aid in the holding of a centennial exposition at Nashville. An appropriation of \$130,000 was made under the act. (December 22, 1896, 29 Stat. 477.)

Texas, 100th anniversary of independence: A joint resolution established a commission to be composed of four persons, including the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce, to represent the United States in connection with the exposition celebrating the observance of the centennial. Government exhibits were authorized to be displayed and the heads of the departments and agencies were required to cooperate in the procurement and installation of such display. An appropriation of \$3 million was authorized. (June 28, 1935, 49 Stat. 431.)

Last week I talked with the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, and urged that the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, of which he is chairman, take prompt action to report the resolution. I appreciate very much the quick action taken by Senator DIRKSEN and the subcommittee, and I am further grateful for the favorable action taken by the Senate Judiciary Committee in reporting the bill to the Senate. This morning, while I was at the White House, in the company of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader, and other Senators, visiting with the President, I asked our majority leader if it might yet be possible, in view of the short time remaining before congressional adjournment, to get Senate approval of the resolution. Senator MANSFIELD assured me that every effort would be made to bring the matter to the floor immediately, and he has kept his promise. I introduced this resolution in behalf of myself and my esteemed colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, on August 7, 1962. Senator RANDOLPH and I join in expressing gratitude for the cooperation and support which we have received in bringing the resolution to the floor. Favorable Senate action today will pave the way for House action before adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 204; Public Law 86-508) is hereby amended by adding the following sections immediately after section 3 thereof:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized to provide for actual participation of the United States in the celebration.

"SEC. 5. In connection with such participation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to: (a) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance, and operation, rental of space, and dismantling; all without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes 3709 (41 U.S.C. 5); (b) accept any gifts, loans, or donations of money, property, or services for use in carrying out the provisions of this Act; (c) procure services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$7½ per diem; and (d) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$100,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act."

INCORPORATION OF THE MERCHANT MARINE & MARITIME SERVICE VETERANS ASSOCIATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 151) for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine & Maritime Service Veterans Association which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 13, after line 23, to strike out:

SEC. 15. (a) The financial transactions of the corporation shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 15. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the following named persons, to wit: Raymond Jacobs, Chicago, Illinois; Thomas T. McWade, Chicago, Illinois; Alfonso DeSoto, Chicago, Illinois; John Scotello, Chicago, Illinois; Robert Broadhead, Chicago, Illinois; Francis L. Staszewski, Chicago, Illinois; E. A. Garrett, Chicago, Illinois; Jack Billow, Chicago, Illinois; Stanley T. Deering, Chicago, Illinois; Richard D. Bieze, Chicago, Illinois; Winston E. Kalberg, Chicago, Illinois; Richard Christ, Chicago, Illinois; Thomas F. Skahill, Chicago, Illinois; Art Payne, Chicago, Illinois; Thomas V. Murphy, Chicago, Illinois; George Laudermith, Chicago, Illinois; Vincent Flack, Chicago, Illinois; Terry Kenny, Chicago, Illinois; Joseph D. Kelly, Chicago, Illinois; Robert Kannberg, Chicago, Illinois;

Robert Kaforski, Chicago, Illinois; Captain David A. Jones, Chicago, Illinois; Walter J. Hetzel, Chicago, Illinois; Jerome J. Fahrenbach, Chicago, Illinois; William Berkovitz, Chicago, Illinois; Charles Ruffner, Chicago, Illinois; George Bean, Chicago, Illinois; Stanley M. Repel, Chicago, Illinois; Harry A. Skinner, Chicago, Illinois; Roscoe J. Williams, Chicago, Illinois; R. T. McWhinnie, Chicago, Illinois; Joseph W. Zinn, Chicago, Illinois; Vincente R. Santos, Chicago, Illinois; Thomas A. Ross, Chicago, Illinois; Phil Provenzano, Chicago, Illinois; Charles Pagels, Chicago, Illinois; Mike Nosai, Chicago, Illinois; John Miaso, Chicago, Illinois; Frank A. Mendyke, Chicago, Illinois; William G. May, Chicago, Illinois; Paul Maresky, Chicago, Illinois; James W. MacKenzie, Chicago, Illinois; Benjamin J. Linkus, Chicago, Illinois; Harold Kowalski, Chicago, Illinois;

Robert P. Haug, Chicago, Illinois; William Harmon, Chicago, Illinois; John S. Hambricht, Chicago, Illinois; August J. Goyke, Chicago, Illinois; William Fitoh, Chicago, Illinois; John Dewar, Chicago, Illinois; Vern Colvin, Chicago, Illinois; Harold Boersma, Chicago, Illinois; Frank Anderson, Chicago, Illinois; James Sheehan, Downers Grove, Illinois; Ira E. Bishop, Homewood, Illinois; Nick J. DeBrown, Franklin Park, Illinois; Raymond E. Gongola, Elmwood Park, Illinois; Frank L. Morgan, Bensenville, Illinois; Michael S. Morgan, Evanston, Illinois; Wellington Collidge, Glenview, Illinois; Darrell B. Conant, Oak Park, Illinois; W. S. Boltenstern, Cambridge, Illinois;

Earl V. Zafft, Lake Villa, Illinois; Raymond L. Loftness, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Eugene A. Peterson, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Dale D. Dean, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Wilbur Reeder, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; E. K. Verley, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Floyd W. Reed, Pickstown, South Dakota; Donald C. Ahern, Brookings, South Dakota; Joe R. McAllister, Madison, South Dakota; Captain Clair F. Bee, Cornwall on the Hudson, New York; Captain Benjamin W. Barbander, Lakeview, New York; Eleuterio Rosa, Bronx, New York; Richard M. Stevenson, Binghamton, New York; Warren Peterson, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Frank H. Throop, Mrshall, Minnesota; Richard R. Powers, Clarksville, Tennessee; Charles R. Kluge, Gary, Indiana; Ralph S. Floyd, Boston, Massachusetts; Leonard A. Cernik, Milwaukee, Wisconsin;

Martin Avignon, Junior, Laurel, Mississippi; Paul H. Apmann, Saint Petersburg, Florida; Elton Dallin, Ashtabula, Ohio; Gordon Westford, Upham, North Dakota; J. Frederick Wormcke, Washington, District of Columbia; Thomas Williams, Davidson, North Carolina; Frank A. Joslyn, Rock Rapids, Iowa; Domenico Gallo, Danbury, Connecticut; Charles Shaw, Detroit, Michigan; John Roscoe, Pueblo, Colorado; Jack Reed, Grand Bay, Alabama; Frank Harveston, Augusta, Georgia; Patrick Vergil, doctor of veterinary medicine, Sulphur, Oklahoma; Richard Maurer, Billings, Montana; James N. Jones, Saint Louis, Missouri; Robert Hotchkiss, Sedley, Virginia; George Holland, New Providence, New Jersey; Laurence N. Holden,

Pawtucket, Rhode Island; James Chrystal, New Orleans, Louisiana; Elwin B. Benson, O'Neill, Nebraska; Robert E. Armstrong, Junior, Portland, Maine; Sterling Hayden, Hollywood, California; Richard L. Anderson, Baltimore, Maryland; Paul Gehris, Wyomissing, Pennsylvania;

K. J. Bailey, Gurnee, Illinois; Harold Whitaker, Holland, Minnesota; Anthony P. Velligan, Gary, Indiana; Leland S. Sorensen, Viborg, South Dakota; Francis W. Smith, New Haven, Connecticut; Robert R. Shebal, San Diego, California; Everett E. Robertson, Junior, Oakland City, Indiana; Thomas J. O'Connor, Los Angeles, California; Edward M. Meagher, Munster, Indiana; B. Alan Stone, Colorado Springs, Colorado; Captain B. Ralph Ludy, Braintree, Massachusetts; James H. Kruser, Toledo, Ohio; Delbert W. Houts, Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin; James P. Grant, Washington, District of Columbia; Anton A. Bernacki, Chicago, Illinois; William Grablak, Mount Pleasant, Pennsylvania; Ken Bruckelmeyer, Worth, Illinois; Clifford Gartmann, Wausau, Wisconsin; Harry C. Douglas, Groton, Connecticut; R. E. Day, San Francisco, California; Kenneth F. Clausen, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin; R. A. Chambers, Buffalo, New York; M. M. Boker, Fort Pierce, Florida; Richard M. Bielski, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Ray J. Arkell, Iona, Minnesota; Bernard R. Wiese, Sheldon, Iowa; Arle Van Ryn, Hoboken, New Jersey; James Swinford, Louisville, Ohio;

John W. Stone, Boothbay Harbor, Maine; Sam Stephenson, Lead, South Dakota; Charles J. Stelchen, Gardena, California; George L. Smokovitch, Escanaba, Michigan; Philip M. Ressegive, Brooklyn, New York; Bud Pierson, Marietta, Georgia; Lieutenant Commander M. A. Parker, U.S.M.S. Saint Petersburg, Florida; Orville Cole, Bloxi, Mississippi; John B. Orrand, Nashville, Tennessee; Stanley P. Morris, Stonington, Connecticut; Donald W. McKone, Washington, District of Columbia; William A. McGregor, North Providence, Rhode Island; Leonides Lopez, New York, New York; Patrick J. Hurley, Dorchester, Massachusetts; Paul A. Hoirlis, Parma, Ohio; John R. Hawkins, East Gary, Indiana; Warren A. Ferguson, Sheffield, Massachusetts; Evan O. Davis, Gary, Indiana; Captain William W. Clandaniel, Baltimore, Maryland; Arthur Chambliss, Mobile, Alabama; Clyde M. Case, Mukwonago, Wisconsin; Francis J. Brady, Clearwater, Florida; R. J. Bish, York, Pennsylvania; Captain John L. Beebe, New Shrewsbury, New Jersey; Raymond F. Hiltgen, Torrance, California; and Robert A. Graves, Minneapolis, Minnesota; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Merchant Marine and Maritime Service Veterans Association (hereinafter referred to as the corporation), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act, acting in person or by written proxy, are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to foster appreciation for the wartime services of veterans of the American Merchant Marine and the United States Maritime Service, and the betterment of the plight of said veterans, through recognized methods of obtainment; the perpetuation of the Memorial Day shipboard ceremony to honor the war dead of these services, as